



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,789	02/12/2007	Roger Melton	28646/42267	8378
4743	7590	12/23/2009		
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE 6300 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357			EXAMINER	
			HANLEY, SUSAN MARIE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1651		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/23/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/590,789	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MELTON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SUSAN HANLEY	<b>Art Unit</b> 1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-63 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

It is noted that a Notice of non-compliant amendment was mailed on 5/5/09 and that Applicant did not respond to it within a one month time frame. In accordance with MPEP 714.01 (e), since Applicant has taken no corrective action, examination the application will commence without consideration of the proposed changes in the non-compliant preliminary amendment of 8/25/2006. Hence, the following restriction is based on the claims as originally filed on 8/25/2006.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

This application contains claims (25-26 and 62) that are drawn to "use". These claims are nonstatutory because they are reasonably interpreted as being directed to a product, a method of making and a method of use.

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I , claim(s) 1-19, 25-46, 62 and 63, drawn to a method for combating toxicity caused by antifolate compounds comprising the administration of carboxypeptidase G to an individual.

Group II, claim(s) 20-24, 62 and 63, drawn to a method of treating a disease.

Group III, claims 25-46, 62 and 63, drawn to carboxypeptidase G.

Group IV, claim(s) 25-46, 62 and 63, drawn to drawn to a method for making carboxypeptidase G.

Group V, claim(s) 47, 48 and 63, drawn to a composition comprising an antifolate compound of formula I and an enzyme having carboxypeptidase G activity.

Group VI, claim(s) 49 and 63, drawn to an ex vivo method for cleaving a terminal L-glutamate moiety from a compound of formula I.

Group VII, claim(s) 50-56 and 63, drawn to a method for determining the rate and/or extent of cleavage of a compound of Formula I.

Group VIII, claim(s) 57-62, drawn to a method of cleaving a compound of formula VIII.

(a) An international or national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept. Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those invention involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

(b) An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

(1) a product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or

(2) a product and a process of use of said product; or

(3) a product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or

(4) a process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out said process; or

(5) a product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out said process.

The groups of invention I, III and IV fall within category (3), a product, a method of making the product and a method of use of that product.

Art Unit: 1651

PCT Rule 13.2 does not provide for multiple compositions or multiple methods of use or making within a single application. Thus, the first appearing composition is combined with a corresponding first method of making and the additional method and composition claims each constitute a separate group.

In addition to the requirement that a group of inventions must belong to one of the specific categories provided by PCT Rule 13.2, the inventions in the category, such as a composition and a method of making of the composition, must have a special technical feature that unites them. See Patent Rules 1.475, where a special technical feature is a contribution OVER THE PRIOR ART.

Thus, the inventions listed as Groups I, III and IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features as demonstrated above. Since the composition AS CLAIMED is known in the art, see Adamson [IDS filed 1/8/2007], which discloses carboxypeptidase G, no special technical feature unites these inventions in a category.

The expression "special technical feature" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art (PCT Rule 13.2). Thus, a feature found in the prior art cannot be considered to be a special technical feature.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Applicant is required to elect one of the following from each category:

- A. an antifolate compound from claim 2;
- B. the enzyme that the antifolate compound inhibits from claim 12;
- C. an antifolate compound of claim 13;

- D. a disease from claim 20; if cancer is elected, the type of cancer from claim 21-23 must also be elected;
- E. an antifolate compound of claim 39;
- F. a disease from claim 43.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic:

For A, claims 1, 3-46, 62 and 63 (corresponding to the election of Group I).  
For B, claims 1-11, 13-46, 62 and 63 (corresponding to the election of Group I).  
For C, claims 1-12, 14-46, 62 and 63 (corresponding to the election of Group I).  
For D, claims 20-24 (corresponding to the election of Group II)  
For E, claims 1-46, 62 and 63,(corresponding to the election of groups I, II or III)..

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The anti-folate compounds have different structures and work by different pathways in the body. The enzymes DHFR and GARFT have different catalytic activities. The disease states have different etiologies and pathologies.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to

be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN HANLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2508. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sandra Saucier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

/Susan Hanley/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1651